

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the consideration shown by the Office as evidenced by the Office Action mailed on April 15, 2003. In that Office Action, the Examiner withdrew from consideration claims 23-51, leaving claims 1-22 under consideration; objected to informalities in the specification and in claims 8 and 9; rejected claims 1, 7-11, 13-17, and 21; objected to claims 2-6, 12, and 18; and allowed claims 19, 20, and 22. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application by the Examiner in light of the above amendment and the following remarks offered in response to the Office Action.

1. Objections on Informalities

In response to the objections set forth by the Examiner, Applicants have amended the Abstract to remove the term "invention" and amended claims 8 and 9 to add periods at the end of each claim. Applicants respectfully submit that the Abstract and claims 8 and 9 are now in proper form.

2. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 8 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for lack of antecedent basis of the phrase "said wire." Applicants have amended the claims at issue to recite "a wire," and respectfully submit that these claims are now in compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Reconsideration of this rejection by the Examiner in light of this amendment is respectfully requested.

3. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 7, 9-11, and 13-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shinohara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,343,792). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants have cancelled claim 2 and incorporated into claim 1 its recitation of a displacement apparatus that "is selected from the group consisting of an actuator, a return device, and combinations thereof." Shinohara does not teach, suggest, or disclose such an apparatus. Furthermore, the Examiner stated in the Office Action that claim 2 recited allowable material, which material is now included in amended claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 and its dependent claims 7, 9-11, and 13-17 are allowable

over the applied reference because the reference fails to teach, suggest, or disclose every element of Applicants' claims.

4. Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner objected to claims 2-6, 12, and 18 as reciting allowable subject matter but depending from a rejected base claim. Applicants have cancelled claim 2 and incorporated its recitation in claim 1. The rest of these claims depend from claim 1, which Applicants believe to be allowable for the reasons set forth above. Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are allowable because they depend from an allowable independent claim.

Applicants note with appreciation the Examiner's allowance of claims 19, 20, and 22.

5. Conclusion

In light of the remarks presented herein, Applicants submit that the case is in condition for immediate allowance and respectfully request such action. If, however, any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul DiConza

Reg. No. 48,418

General Electric Company

Building K1, Room 3A60

Telephone: (518) 387-6131

Schenectady, New York
Tuesday, July 15, 2003